

Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland 1689-90

1—JAMES BY DIVINE RIGHT

REV. D. H. WHITEFORD, Q.H.C., M.A., B.D., PH.D.

THE JUMBLE OF THE TIMES

When the news of the Prince of Orange's landing at Torbay reached Scotland Presbyterians in the Lowlands, in turn persecuted, suppressed and, after a fashion tolerated, took violent and defiant action which showed only too clearly their hatred of the old regime.

The Edinburgh mob¹ attacked the new Thistle Chapel at Holyroodhouse, recently fitted out by the King for Popish worship and reduced its magnificent carved stalls and costly furnishings to ruins. The students of the College marched to the Cross and there burned an effigy of the Pope. The heads and hands of the martyrs were taken down from the gates of the city and reverently buried.² At Glasgow Cross³ Lord Loudoun, then a student at the University, and a number of his companions, burned effigies of the Pope and the Archbishop of St. Andrews without any opposition. Throughout the Western and Southern shires parties of Cameronian hill-men and groups of angry militant parishioners "rabbed" the Episcopalian incumbents. John Sage,⁴ the Episcopalian pamphleteer, claims that some 200 were rabbed in this way throughout Ayrshire, Clydesdale, Nithsdale and Annandale.

In some instances this rabbling was harsh and severe but considering the times by no means as cruel and as brutal as the Episcopalian pamphleteers, Morer, Sage and Munro⁵, made it out to be when writing up

¹ Rule, Gilbert, *A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland. Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, Edinburgh (1691), p. 35; Wilson, *Memorials of Edinburgh*, Vol. I, p. 139.

² *A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland*, by Two Persons of Quality (1689).

³ MacGregor, G., *History of Glasgow*, p. 269.

⁴ Sage, John, *Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Presented* (1690), p. 6.

⁵ Sage, *Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, Preface p. 2, Morer, Thomas; Sage, John; Munro, Alex., *Account of the Present Persecution in Several Letters* (1690).

these events in order to gain moral and financial support in England. Gilbert Rule, in his *Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*,¹ deals in great detail with the individual cases of extreme cruelty which the Episcopalian pamphleteers allege and has no great difficulty in producing evidence which severely qualifies their assertions.

In most parishes it was not required to use physical violence to be rid of the Episcopalian incumbent. In parishes where the old Presbyterian minister had returned and ministered to his people in terms of the Indulgence, the Episcopalian might quietly desert his charge since he knew too well the temper of his people: in instances where this did not take place a show of force was sufficient to oust the minister. Many of the incumbents who either deserted or demitted their charges at the Revolution, or who were "outed" without any recourse to physical violence went across the Border to England and found a living there. Some went to Ireland but others quietly took up other occupations in Scotland.

Thomas Moubray,² of Uphall, Alexander Nicolson,³ of Bonkyl, James Kynneir,⁴ of Annan, Roger Lawson,⁵ of Ruthwell, and Thomas Blair,⁶ of Coldstream, went to England. Patrick Peacock,⁷ of Ochiltree, Samuel Mowat,⁸ of Crawfordjohn, Lauchlan Ross,⁹ of Carmichael, went to Ireland. The ministers of Hutton¹⁰ and Caerlaverock¹¹ retired to their own properties and lived the life of private gentlemen. Robert Douglas,¹² of Bothwell, went off to become the Keeper of the Leighton Library at Dunblane. Norman MacKenzie,¹³ of Mid Calder, left his parish and became a brewer in Edinburgh.

Where, however, the Episcopalian incumbents had taken an active part in bringing their non-conforming parishioners to the notice of the authorities, armed men and threat of pistols were used to dislodge them. At Ayr,¹⁴ on the 14th June, 1689, a party of armed hill-men "discharged" the town ministers from ever preaching there again. Robert Symson,¹⁵ of Galston, had taken steps to persecute some of his parishioners for not attending the parish church. He was taken from his manse and put

¹ Rule, *A Second Vindication*, Preface, para. 6; *Leven and Melville Papers*. Preface, p. XXIX.

² *Fasti*, Vol. I, p. 233.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 241.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 258.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 40.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 61.

⁸ *Fasti.*, Vol. III, p. 218.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 288.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 206.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 258.

¹² *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 231.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 177; Rule, *Second Vindication*, p. 182.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, op. 9, 11.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 39; Rule, *Second Vindication*, p. 33.

through the Irvine water and thrust out of the parish. Robert Boyd,¹ of Carmunnock, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, had been "a great informer and instigator against his parishioners, even sitting with the magistrates on the bench": he was rudely ejected from his manse by some of them in return. Robert Finnie,² of Cathcart, had made himself so obnoxious to his people by his persecuting spirit that on the night the Prince of Orange was proclaimed in Glasgow his parishioners lit a bonfire outside the manse: the import of which was not lost on Mr. Finnie.

At Keir,³ in the Presbytery of Penpont, Alexander Guthrie had informed against several of his parishioners who had been severely fined as a result. At his instigation also a party of dragoons had been sent to the parish of Irongray where they "killed four men and hung them on a tree". When the chance came he was roughly ejected by his parishioners. Mr. Graham, of Lochmaben, Mr. Brown, of Dryfesdale, and Mr. Thompson, of Applegarth, had "whispered in the ear"⁴ of Graham of Claverhouse when he sat on the bench judging Presbyterians for non-compliance: these men were all dealt with by their parishioners in 1689. At Auchinleck⁵ a party of ninety armed men "rabbed" the minister who had required the protection of a troop of dragoons at his installation to the parish in 1684. At Kilmarnock,⁶ Mr. Robert Bell was dealt with by a well armed party of 200 resolute men, who "required him not to preach any more". They were equally harsh, however, in their treatment of the Presbyterian preachers in the meeting houses who had accepted James's indulgence: to the extreme Cameronian mind they too were "apostates and preachers of the Duke of York's Gospel".

At this stage there was little that the Prince of Orange could have done about the situation in Scotland. There were no troops north of the Tweed, if there had been their use might only have resulted in bloody disorder. A proclamation, however, was made from London directing that all men should lay down their arms, and that, till the Convention should have settled the question of government, the clergy of the established Church should be allowed to remain in their parishes. It had little effect. On the very day that this proclamation was read in Glasgow,⁷ the Cathedral was rabbed and the worshippers dispersed and beaten with snowballs.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 379; *Rule, Second Vindication*, p. 28.

² *Fasti*, III, 382; *Rule, Second Vindication*, p. 27.

³ *Ibid.*, II, p. 317; *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁴ *Rule, Second Vindication*, Postscript p. 193, Section 6; *Fasti.*, II, 213, 204, 199.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 89; *Ibid.*, III, 3.

⁶ *Rule, Second Vindication*, p. 30; *Fasti*, III, 105.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

"Rabbling" was a spontaneous explosion against a hated Church Establishment. It had neither legal nor ecclesiastical authority behind it. When, however, the new Parliament met it did nothing to undo what the Rabblers had done. It neither restored those incumbents who had been rabbled nor offered them any protection in their legal rights. It declared their parishes to be vacant and deprived them of their stipends.¹

This was a most severe sentence if these men were not "enemies to the Government". Were they "enemies" or "friends"? During the debate in Parliament upon their Petition to the Commissioner for protection, this question was put by Lord Cardross. On the demonstration of their relationship to the new Government much was to depend. The issue was not left for long in doubt.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL REGISTER

On 13th April, 1689, the Estates issued an order that the parochial clergy should on pain of deprivation read from their pulpits the Proclamation of the new King and Queen, and should pray for King William and Queen Mary by name.

This was the crucial test. When faced with it the great majority of the Episcopalian incumbents still in possession of their parishes refused. Where this refusal had taken place the Privy Council asked for information to be laid before it concerning the conduct of the defaulting ministers. *The Privy Council Register for 1689*² shows some 200 cases which appeared before it on charges of not reading the Proclamation and not praying for King William and Queen Mary.

Many of the ministers charged defended themselves before the Privy Council with great skill. They pleaded that they had been given insufficient time to decide on a matter of such weight and importance.³ They pleaded that the Sheriffs of the Shires had not sent the Proclamation in time. They pleaded that the Proclamation had not been ordered to be read by the legally constituted Church authority.

¹ Sage, John, *Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland* (1690); *Petition of the Ministers who were thrust from their Churches by force and violence in December, 1688, or at any time thereafter, before the 13th day of April, 1689. Unto His Grace their Majesties Commissioner, and the Honourable Estates of Parliament: Proclamation of Estates, 13th April, 1689, deprived of stipends, etc.*, p. 55, Petition, p.p 56-75, Debate in Estates.

² *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, Vol. 14 (1689) Introduction, p. XVII.

³ Sage, *Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, pp. 11-16.

Dr. Strachan,¹ of Edinburgh University, defended himself on the ground that since William and Mary had not yet taken the Coronation Oath they could not be considered King and Queen until they had done so; and, therefore, could not be prayed for by name as King and Queen.

But many had not only refused to read the Proclamation as the law required; they had also made some irrevocable declarations from their pulpits in favour of the exiled King. The mass of evidence of this kind which the Privy Council Register contains shows clearly where the loyalty of the Episcopal party lay.

William Nasmyth,² of Eckford, had prayed deliberately for the restoration of King James, destruction to his enemies, and that "God would take the Usurper (King William) out of the way". James Lumsden,³ of Lauder, had prayed that "God would give him (James) the neck of his enemies, and the hearts of his subjects". William McKechnie,⁴ of Bonhill, told the Council that "he had taken an oath to King James and would not obey King William's authority", and had also encouraged others "to disown the authority of their present Majesties". Dr. William Gairns,⁵ of the Tolbooth, Edinburgh, prayed for the King and Queen "as one would do for a thief going to the gibbet", which was regarded as "a manifest contempt of the Estates in not owning King William and Queen Mary as our King and Queen". Mr. David Guild,⁶ minister of the West Kirk, was accused of being a "spy and intelligencer" for the Castle, and at having directed the fire of the Castle guns. "For which cause the said Mr. David was noticed and seized by the guards and kept prisoner all night in the weigh house". He also, it appears, had been pretty plain in his speech to his parishioners, and had reproached and upbraided "several who were well affected to the Government calling them whoares and rogues and wearing and showing pistols under his coat, things most unsuitable in a minister and contrair to the express acts of Parliament".

John Barclay,⁷ minister at Kettle, instead of reading the Proclamation and praying for William and Mary, had expressed himself in these terms. "That he trusted in God to see the late King James on his throne, and that he would be in Scotland against the 4th of June next with a brave army". When news reached his parish that Major General McKay had

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

² *Fasti*, II, 110.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 154.

⁴ *Fasti*, III, 331.

⁵ *Privy Council Register*, 1689, Vol. 14. Sederunt 17th September, p. 287.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Sederunt, 16th August, p. 59.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Sederunt, 27th August, p. 106.

been defeated at Killiecrankie, "he most affectionately prayed for the restoration of the late King James, and that God would confound and defeat all his enemies, and still continues to do so, and to poison all the people with the same principle". In addition, Mr. Barclay had made his manse "a cabballing place for those who were disaffected to the Government", and had invited to preach from his pulpit some of his brethren "who had been actually deprived of their benefice and office". The Privy Council decided that "the continuation of such a person in the ministerial function especially in that place of the country might prove very pernicious and extremely disadvantageous to the interest of the present Government".

Mr. John Lambie,¹ minister of Ecclesgreig, "did not only pray publicly for the late King to have him restored to his throne and to make him a nursing father in this Zion, but also kept constant correspondence and intelligence with the late Viscount Dundee and the other rebels". He had also helped to convey safely Mr. David Graeme, Dundee's brother, to Marykirk, and had persuaded the minister there to send his Reader to warn the rebels that "Sir John Lanier was upon his march from Brechin to Forfar to attack them". William Irvine,² later non Jurant Bishop of Brechin, left his parish of Kirkmichael to join Dundee at Killiecrankie: he was captured and put in prison but managed to escape to France. Robert Stewart,³ minister of Balquidder, went to Killiecrankie in support of Viscount Dundee, but declined to appear before the Privy Council when summoned to do so for this action. John Murray,⁴ minister of Scone, was unable to take the field, himself, but sent his brother to the battle with these words; "God's curse, and my curse befall you, if you leave the Viscount until you return victorious".

On 7th November, 1689, the Privy Council dealt with five ministers⁵ from the Presbyteries of Strathbogie and Turriff, namely, Sir James Strachan, of Keith, Mr. Arthur Strachan, of Mortlach, Mr. John Henderson, of Deskford, Mr. John Hay, of Rathven, and Mr. Patrick Chalmers, of Boyndie. They were accused of certain specific acts, namely, omitting significant clauses from the Proclamation, or influencing and pressing men in their parishes to join in the Rebellion.

The real gravamen of the charges brought against them was summed up in the following extract from the proceedings:

¹ *Privy Council Register*, 1689, Vol. 14. Sederunt, 10th September, p. 241.

² *Fasti*, III, 44.

³ *Ibid.*, IV, 337.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 251.

⁵ *Privy Council Register*, 1689, Vol. 14. Sederunt, 7th November, p. 466.

"They had shaken off all fear of God and adherence and respect to the Protestant religion and the due reverence and alledgeance they owe to their present Majesties, the glorious instrument of our delivery from Popery and arbitrary power, they were so far from evidencing the just sense they ought to have had of his Majesty's preservation of our religion and of our relief from these grievous circumstances the nation groaned under", that "in contempt" for all these things they "prayed daily for the late King and his restoration to the throne".

Rumour was spread about in England that the Episcopalian incumbents were being deprived in Scotland not for their breach of law "but only for Episcopacy". Rule says in answer to this rumour: "On the contrary, we can show that such as have suffered by the State, did suffer for their breach of the law of the Nation, in not owning the King and Queen as the law required".¹

The second indictment brought against the action of the Council was that it allowed charges of a scandalous or immoral character to be included in the information laid before it. This, undoubtedly, was the case, but Rule refutes this indictment and declares that no charges of this nature were ever considered by the Council. "The Council did not consider their immorality, nor freedom from it, but only their obedience or disobedience to the law".² The evidence of the Privy Council Register supports this contention.

Unlike the proceedings of the Council in Carstares' day, when the boot and the thumbscrew were in fashion, the Register for 1689 shows that a serious attempt was made to administer justice in terms of the charges brought against the Episcopalian ministers and that where there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the charge it was allowed to fall. Of the 200 cases which came before the Council, Crawford tells Melville, in a letter dated 24th October, 1689, that he deserted the summons in no fewer than thirty-three cases.³

LORD CRAWFORD'S LETTERS

No statesman of the time was more involved in the process of legal deprivation than the Earl of Crawford, President of the Council. In a series of letters to Lord Melville between July, 1689, and January, 1690,

¹ Rule, *Second Vindication: An Answer to a late Letter concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy*, p. 132.

² *Ibid.*, *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy Examined*, p. 99.

³ *Leven and Melville Papers: Crawford's Letter to Melville dated 24th October, 1689*, p. 425.

he set down in plain terms the problems with which he had to deal as they related to the Episcopalian incumbents.

On 4th July¹ he wrote: "The conform preachers have everywhere debauched the people, and rendered them disaffected to the civil government; nor have one of six read the proclamation, or prayed for our King and Queen, nor observed the Thanksgiving; and yet these are not deprived, according to the tenour of that proclamation, nor are as much as cited, lest we displease the Commissioner. Yea, the most of the conformists have expressly prayed against our King, and for the late King, and have hounded out their people to rise in arms, and now do boast that whatever injury they had by the Meeting of Estates shall be repaired to them by Parliament . . .

"It is evident that the number of the King's friends is small in this nation, except those who are of the Presbyterian way, and that every one of these are unalterably for him".

Again, on 10th August,² he wrote: "The bulk of the conformists are everywhere praying for the late King; for though some of these may be more reserved in their way than others, all of them are of the same inclinations, and have dis-served our King's interest more than the army that hath been in the fields in opposition to us". He goes on to warn Melville: "It is vain to expect peace in this nation until the Presbyterian government be settled, and these disturbers of our quiet be laid waste, and such as countenance them be divested of power".

By Episcopalians such as John Sage no man was viewed as being more "bigoted" to the interests of Presbyterianism than Crawford. Even Burnet accepts this view for a time, and regards the actions of the Privy Council as a "frantic and furious breaking out against such of the Episcopal party as had escaped the rage of the former years".³ In general this appears to have been the view of Scottish affairs by English Churchmen. Melville wrote to Crawford in December, 1689, saying: "The Convocation here flies high: their pretence is the vigour used against these of their persuasion in Scotland, which they say, if not redressed, they will show less favour to the Nonconformists here".⁴

¹ *Leven and Melville Papers*: Letter from Crawford to Melville, dated 4th July, 1689, p. 139.

² *Ibid.*, 10th August, 1689, p. 248.

³ *Leven and Melville Papers*, Preface, p. XXIX; Burnet, *Own Times*, Vol. II, p. 95; Sage, *An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government*, p. 90.

⁴ *Privy Council Register*, 1689, Vol. 14. Introduction, p. XVII.

Burnet, however, came to change his mind about the Episcopalians north of the Tweed. He admits later that it was impossible for William to have preserved Episcopacy in Scotland, "had he been ever so zealous for it". For "the Episcopal party went almost universally into King James's interests, so that the Presbyterians were the only party that the King had in that kingdom".¹

He has some very hard things to say, too, about his fellow Episcopalians when he finds that they have played false over the conditions required for granting a toleration. He maintains bluntly that they never had any intention of engaging loyally in the King's interest and that their whole scheme had been but "an artifice to disgust the Presbyterians".²

Crawford was, again, severely criticised by the Episcopalians for his purging of the Universities, when his Commission³ was accused of proceeding with "more zeal for Presbytery than regard for learning". Crawford himself presided over the Committee investigating St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Lord Carmichael went to Glasgow. Both Carmichael and Crawford deprived those members of the Universities' staffs who refused to sign the Confession of Faith, or take the Oath of Allegiance and subscribe the Assurance. There is no doubt as to the academic competence of Drs. Skene Munro and Fall, but because they stubbornly refused to take the oaths to the new Sovereigns they had to be deposed. To allow them to remain in the positions they occupied in the Universities of Scotland was to subject the King's interest to far too grave a risk.

Crawford was, of course, in Episcopalian eyes, a "bigoted" Presbyterian. Melville had sacrificed a great deal for the Presbyterian cause. Neither man could be said to be entirely impartial in these matters. Their Correspondence, however, reveals men who faced a situation in which the vital factors spoke for themselves irrespective of either Crawford's or Melville's personal inclinations: their advice was that the only bulwark that could be raised in Scotland in defence of the King's interests was the speedy settlement of Presbytery and the deprivation of the representatives of Episcopacy.

On 12th October, 1689,⁴ Crawford wrote to Melville in obvious rebuttal of English criticism of his handling of the Episcopal ministers in Scotland.

¹ *Leven and Melville Papers*, Preface, p. XXIX; Burnet, *History of Own Times*, Vol. II, p. 24.

² Burnet, *History of Own Times*, Vol. II, p. 74.

³ Sage, *An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government*. The Visitation of the Universities of St. Andrews, Edinburgh and Glasgow, p. 87-95.

⁴ *Leven and Melville Papers*, Letters from Crawford to Melville, dated 12th October, 1689, p. 301.

"None were deprived", he insists, "where there was express praying for our King and Queen, even though there had been a neglect in reading of that Proclamation, so peremptorly enjoined by the meeting of Estates, providing they had not contemptuously refused to read it, which some did, (who otherwise prayed for our King and Queen), as being unfree to approve the laying aside of King James. Where that Proclamation was really read, either by ministers or precentors, by their order and authority so far countenanced, we did not deprive such tho' they had only prayed in indirect terms for the King and Queen, notwithstanding of the tenour of the Proclamation; that appoints them to be named and prayed for as our King and Queen".

He, then, comes to the crux of the matter: "But the truth is there were few before us but had transgressed in all respects". He returns again to the defence of what had been done by the Privy Council in a letter to Melville, dated 21st January, 1690:¹

"I shall once more repeat what I have oft said on this subject, that no Episcopal man since the happy Revolution, whether laick or of the clergy, hath suffered by the Council upon account of his opinions in Church matters, but allenearly for their disowning the civil authority, and setting up for a cross interest. If I make not this good, I shall willingly forfault my credit with his Majesty and all good men".

The weight of evidence in the sources which we have been investigating would appear to support the view that ministers were not deprived because they were for Episcopacy as against Presbytery: they were deprived because their Jacobitism found its expression in their Episcopacy. An Episcopacy which had been prepared to read the Proclamation and pray for the new King and Queen would have survived the Revolution in Scotland as it did in England.

THE SCOTTISH BISHOPS

The essential, firm and unshakeable loyalty which the Episcopalians showed towards the House of Stuart sprang from more than political considerations. While, no doubt, men did look for a political restoration of the Royal House, and were loyal to this political hope for more than half a century, the explanation of their "interminable and steadfast

¹ *Leven and Melville Papers*. Letter from Crawford to Melville, dated 21st January, 1690, p. 305. Also letter dated 25th April, 1691—"This Church division, in opposition to the legal establishment, will in this Nation be found to be a stated difference for King William and the late King. If it be found otherwise in the issue, let me be reckoned an imposter and the betrayer of our King's interest", p. 602.

allegiance" does not lie here. It is to be found rather in their stubbornly held doctrine of divinely ordered monarchy: in an order of kingship that was as divinely ordained as their own Episcopal order.

Early in 1688 Archbishop Ross, in his capacity as Chancellor of the University of St. Andrews, sent up a Loyal Address¹ to James II. This Address begins by paying tribute to the constant liberality of the Royal House both to Church and University. It then proceeds to expound what was the current view of the doctrine of Monarchy.

God is the only source of power, not the people. In every regularly constituted society there must be a seat of absolute power. Hereditary monarchy is superior to every other form of government. More evil results are to be feared from democratic excesses than from the exercise of absolute monarchy. The absolute power of monarchy must never be resisted, and may be disobeyed only when it opposes Scripture.

When the Archbishop and his fellow Bishops heard that attempts were being made in England to dispossess James and bring over the Prince of Orange, they met together in Edinburgh, and sent up to the King a loyal and dutiful address, in which they reaffirmed their own loyalty, and expressed their dismay at hearing of the intended invasion from Holland.

They ended their address with these words: "As, by the grace of God, we shall preserve in ourselves a firm and unshakeable loyalty, so we shall be careful and zealous to promote in all your subjects an interminable and steadfast allegiance to Your Majesty, as an essential part of our religion, and of the glory of our holy profession: not doubting but that God in his great mercy, who hath so often preserved and delivered your Majesty, will still preserve and deliver you by giving you the hearts of your subjects and the necks of your enemies". This Address was signed by the twelve Bishops on 3rd November, 1688, at Edinburgh.

Events, however, fulfilled the fears of the Scottish Bishops, and Bishop Rose of Edinburgh found himself in a London from which James had fled, a London which had hailed the Prince of Orange as the Deliverer. Believing profoundly in the divine right of monarchy, bound by oath to the King who had fled, faced with a set of circumstances about which he had received no instructions from his fellow Bishops before leaving Scotland, what was Rose to do?

¹ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson, MSS. 985 C. No. 114. Address to the King by the University of St. Andrews; Lyon, *History of St. Andrews*, Vol. II, p. 106; Skinner, *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. II, p. 512; Lyon, *History of St. Andrews*, Vol. II, p. 107.

At a meeting of the Scottish peers at Whitehall on 7th January, 1689, a proposal was made by the Earl of Arran that James should be asked to return and call a free Parliament. This proposal was rejected but in his speech Arran expressed with great clarity the dilemma in which the Bishops found themselves.¹

“I cannot violate my duty to my master. I must distinguish between his Popery and his person: I dislike the one, but I have sworn to do owe allegiance to the other, which makes it impossible for me to sign away that which I cannot forbear believing is the King my master’s right; for his present absence from us in France can no more affect my duty, than his longer absence from us (in England) has done all this while”.

Archbishop Sancroft and his Non Juring colleagues were far too concerned with their own predicament to be able to advise their brother from Scotland.² Gilbert Burnet gave him a cold reception and stated that “he did not meddle in Scottish affairs”. Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, gave Rose all the help that he could, but the Bishops in England faced division among themselves over this very issue. Sancroft kept to his palace and refused to accept William. It is not to be wondered at that they had no wish to entangle themselves in Scottish problems.

William was now no longer the Prince of Orange, summoned from Holland to assist in calling a free Parliament. On 13th February, both Houses of the Convention Parliament had presented William and Mary with an Address declaring them King and Queen of England, France and Ireland.

Could Rose address the Prince under his new title? To do so would be a fatal compromise for his conscience and for his party. He makes preparations, therefore, to return to Scotland, but finds that to do so he requires a pass from the King. He turns again to the Bishop of London for advice and Compton insists that he should see William before he departs.³

Compton arranged for Rose to meet the King and conveyed to Rose the gist of his own conversation with William on Scottish affairs. So that Rose was by no means ignorant of William’s appreciation of the present position of the Church parties in Scotland.

¹ Keith, *Scottish Bishops*, Appendix, p. 495.

² Carpenter, *The Protestant Bishop*, p. 301.

³ Episcopal Chest MSS., Edinburgh, No. 1833. A full Account of Rose’s visit to London is given in a letter from Rose to Mr. Archibald Campbell, at London, dated 23rd October, 1713; Keith, *Scottish Bishops*, p.p 65-72.

"You see my lord, the King having thrown himself upon the water, must keep himself a swimming with one hand. The Presbyterians have joined him closely and offer to support him, and therefore he cannot cast them off, unless he could see how otherwise he could be served. And he bids me tell you that he now knows the State of Scotland much better than he did when he was in Holland. For while there he was made to believe that Scotland generally all over was Presbyterian, but now he sees that the great body of the nobility and gentry are for Episcopacy and it is the trading and inferior sort that are for Presbytery. Wherefore he bids me tell you, that if you will undertake to serve him to the purpose that he is served here in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church and Order, and throw off the Presbyterians".

Whether this was a very accurate account of William's appreciation of the situation in Scotland we do not know. It may well be that Compton was merely presenting the King's view in as favourable a light as possible. He certainly makes the issue very clear to Rose. Perhaps, in hope that disaster for Episcopacy in Scotland might be averted, and a basis for comprehension between the two parties achieved on the ground of their common loyalty to William and Mary.

If this was Compton's intention it was an idle dream. Rose's answer was: "My lord, I cannot but humbly thank the Prince for his frankness and offer;—but withal I must tell your Lordship, that when I came from Scotland, neither my brethren nor I apprehended any such Revolution as I have now seen in England, and therefore I neither was, nor could be, instructed by them what answer to make to the Prince's offer; and therefore what I say is not in their name but only my private opinion, which is that I truly think they will not serve the Prince so as he is served in England; that is (as I take it) to make him their King, or give their suffrage for his being King. And though as to this matter I can say nothing in their name, and as from them, yet for myself I must say, that rather than do so I will abandon all the interest that either I have, or may expect to have in Britain".

Compton, it appears, accepted this as a true statement of the view of the Scottish Bishops about the Revolution in England. He says, merely, that he believes this to be the case. "For all the time you have been here, neither have you waited on the King, nor have any of your brethren, the Scots bishops, made any address to him. So the King must be excused for standing by the Presbyterians". The next day the interview with the King arranged by Compton took place.

Again, we follow Rose's narrative.

The King expressed the hope that he "would be kind" to him, "and follow the example of England". "Wherefore", Rose says, "being somewhat diffculted how to make a mannerly and discrete answer, without entangling myself, I readily replied—Sir, I will serve you as far as law, reason, or conscience allow me. How this answer pleased the Prince I cannot well tell; but it seems the limitations and conditions of it were not acceptable, for instantly the Prince, without saying anything more, turned away from me, and went back to his company".

Canon Carpenter,¹ in his Life of Bishop Compton, *The Protestant Bishop*, puts forward the view that it would have been better if Rose had never met the King in this fateful interview. Compton should have advised him to return to Scotland some weeks earlier and thus prevented this head on confrontation. But would such a move really have succeeded? Rose knew well the issues with which he had to deal. His answer whether given at once to the King or postponed until he had returned for consultations with his brethren in Scotland could have been no different. It sprang not from political considerations but from deep theological convictions. It would have been the same whether Rose had met William face to face or not.

This is borne out later in Rose's narrative when he records an interview he had with the Duke of Hamilton after his return to Scotland.²

"After my coming down here, my lord St. Andrews and I taking occasion to wait on Duke Hamilton, his Grace told us, a day or two before the sitting down of the Convention, that he had a special charge from King William that nothing should be done to the prejudice of Episcopacy in Scotland, in case the Bishops could by any means be brought to befriend his interest: and prayed us most pathetically, for our own sake, to follow the example of the Church of England. To which my lord St. Andrews replied that, both by natural allegiance, the laws, and the most solemn oaths, we were engaged in the King's interest; and that we were, by God's grace, to stand by it in the face of all dangers and to the greatest losses".

It was not too late for the Scottish bishops at this stage to have revoked Rose's answer given in London, if they had so desired. But Rose had not been mistaken, when he spoke for himself, he spoke for them all. With the answer which he had given they never made any compromise.

¹ Carpenter, *The Protestant Bishop*, p. 305.

² Keith, *Scottish Bishops*, p. 65.

THE NEW THEOLOGY

In his *Ecclesiastical History*,¹ John Skinner, the Episcopalian historian, links together the position taken up by the Scottish bishops with that of the English Non Jurors. "Every defence", he says, "that the ejected succession in England could make for themselves, is applicable to the Scottish cause with equal propriety and force". We are in no position to understand fully the situation in which the Scottish Episcopalians found themselves unless we have some insight into the nature of the theological crisis which the events of the Revolution had thrust upon them. A new theology of kingship had arisen in England which they found themselves unable to approve or accept.

In 1689 and 1690 the pens of English Churchmen wrote innumerable pamphlets and sermons about the Revolution issues² which confronted them, and the crisis of theological thought, conscience and personal decision it brought in its wake.

"Reasons", "Answers", "Reflections", "Speeches", "Letters" deal with the themes which divided English clerics into two uncompromising opposed parties.

"The Divine right of Kings"; "the Original Contract between Prince and People"; "the Obligations of Kings to conform to their Oaths"; "the Right of forcible Resistance to the tyranny of Rulers"; "the Effect of an Abdication on the right of a legitimate Heir"; "the Right of the People to Depose the King"; "the True Nature of a Churchman of the Church of England"—these were the issues of the day.

In *A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange, by a true Protestant of the Church of England as established by law*, for example, the writer approves entirely of the aims of the Prince of Orange, namely, to restore the Assembly of Estates to France, to relieve the French Protestants, to

¹ Skinner, *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. II, p. 580.

² *Somers Tracts*, Vol. I, p. 291, Some Reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration; p. 303, An Answer to a Paper entitled Reflections on the Prince of Orange's Declaration; p. 400, Reasons Why the Rector of P took the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary; p. 346, A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange by a true Protestant of the Church of England, as established by law; Vol. 2, p. 546, A Word to a Wavering Levite; Or an Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Reasons concerning the taking of Oaths; p. 553, The true Character of a Churchman, shewing the false pretences to that name; p. 577, Obedience due to the Present King, notwithstanding our Oaths to the former. Written by a Divine of the Church of England; p. 595, A Letter concerning Allegiance, written by the Lord Bishop of London, to a Clergyman in Essex, presently after the Revolution.

revive the Edict of Nantes, and to settle the peace of Europe, he is prepared to accept William as the Restorer of English liberties, and to secure the Protestant religion, but if he goes further than this if he is either crowned himself, or allows his princess to be crowned, support for William is withdrawn. To do this, he contends, would be to blemish their religion with the deposing doctrine, and would create such strong factions among the people of England that they would never be composed until the King was restored. Archbishop Sancroft, staunch Non Juror, reveals his mind on the crisis of conscience which the Revolution brought to him.¹ "As the laws of England stand", he wrote, "nothing can colour the exclusion of the present King, and the setting up of another, although we should suppose the whole people of England acting on it, unless we suppose also that they have an authority residing in them to judge, depose, and elect kings ad libitum". Such a liberty and right Sancroft and his fellow Bishops believed to be contrary to the known laws of God. How could he commit perjury, and take oaths to a usurper, believing that King James was the only lawful and divinely ordered King of the Realm? This was the crux of the legal, political, theological, and ethical crisis in the midst of which he found himself as Archbishop, he could resolve it only in one way, by refusing to take the Oaths to the new King, even if this step were to cost him his See.

This was the view of all his Non Juring colleagues,² Bath and Wells, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich, Peterborough, Worcester, Chichester, and Chester. None of them were young men. Three were to die within a year. It was the fear of the saintly Bishop Ken,³ that they would be exposed to the world as "men of no conscience" for the stand they took. They were, on the contrary, men of the most sensitive and scrupulous conscience, and were fully prepared to suffer for it.

The Bishop of Gloucester⁴ said on his death bed: "I think I could burn at the stake before I took this new oath". The Bishop of Chichester⁵ made an almost identical declaration under similar circumstances. "If the oath had been tendered at the peril of my life", he said, "I could only have obeyed by suffering". The issues between the Non Jurors and the

¹ D'Oyley, *Life of Archbishop Sancroft*, p. 417; Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner MSS., Vol. 459. *The Present State of the English Government Considered*, January, 1688.

² D'Oyley, *Life of Archbishop Sancroft*, p. 437.

³ *Life of Bishop Ken*, by a Layman, Vol. II, 508-509; *Scottish Bishops*, Keith, p. 498.

⁴ D'Oyley, *Life of Archbishop Sancroft*, p. 437.

⁵ *Life of Bishop Ken*, Vol. II, p. 508.

supporters of William were summed up by contemporary writers in Four Main Propositions.¹

1. That the Powers of Kings was originally Patriarchal, Derived from God and not from the People.
2. That Descent in Hereditary Kingdoms is the ordinary way whereby a Right and Title to the Crown is claimed.
3. That no violence is to be used to Kings from their own subjects for any irregularities they commit.
4. That having sworn Allegiance to a Prince, we cannot without the dreadful guilt of perjury transfer our Allegiance, while he continues to have authoratitive Right and Title to the Crown.

After the Restoration of the Monarchy these doctrines had become, indeed, in England the theological bulwark against a return of Republicanism. These were the ideas current in English ecclesiastical thought when Sancroft and his fellow Non Juring Bishops were younger men, and were accepted and supported by some of the Churchmen who came to oppose these very conceptions with such great vehemence at the Revolution, namely, Tillotson, Burnet and Sherlock.

In a tract, *The Case of Resistance to the supreme powers stated and Resolved*, written in the reign of Charles II, Sherlock had argued for the doctrine of passive obedience in its most extreme form. "Though kings should be merciless tyrants", he asserts, "they are above all law, and are accountable to God alone". Yet the pressure of events forced Sherlock to move from this extreme position. He changed his mind, and set out the reasons and vindication for his changed views at great length in a new pamphlet, *The Case for Allegiance, stated and resolved according to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England*.

Burnet, Sherlock and William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph,² wrote

¹ Wagstaffe, Thomas, *An Answer to a late Pamphlet: entitled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, with a Postscript*, p. 2. Four Propositions.

² Burnet, *An Enquiry into the present State of Affairs: Whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? Whether we are bound to treat with him, and call him back again or not?* Sherlock, William, *Their Present Majesties Government Proved to be Thoroughly Settled and that we may submit to it, without Asserting the Principles of Mr. Hobbs. Occasioned by some late Pamphlets against the Rev. Dr. Sherlock. The Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers Stated and Resolved according to Scripture and Reason and the Principles of the Church of England*: Sherlock, William, *A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers in Reply to an Answer to a late Pamphlet*; Lloyd, William, *A Letter to Dr. Sherlock in Vindication of that part of Josephus's History which gives an Account of Iaddus the High Priest submitting to Alexander the Great while Darius was living. Against the Answer to the piece entitled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government*: Taylor, Zachary, *Overalls Convocation Books*.

pamphlets and preached sermons in which they advanced with consummate erudition the full weight of their argument in support of the new theology of Kingship. It was not an age in which one jot or tittle of an opponent's argument was left unanswered, and their writings deal very thoroughly with all the points at issue.

A new theological understanding of Kingship was in process of being hammered out. Who appoints Kings? "All Sovereign Princes who are settled in their thrones are placed there by God",¹ writes Sherlock. "God sets up a King when by his Providence He advances him to the throne. He removes a king when by His Providence He thrusts him from his throne, and takes the Government out of his hands. For Providence is God's Government of the world, whereby He directs, determines or over-rules all events to the accomplishment of His own Will and Counsels".²

Against those who would argue that they are bound in conscience to adhere to a King, who though out of possession, by the laws of the land has a legal right to the Crown, against the King who is actually settled in the Throne, *de facto*, by the Providence of God, Sherlock contends that such a position opposes the Providence of God, against the Providence of God, His former Providence against His later Providence. "They will not allow", he says, "the Providence of God to change and alter, whatever reasons the Divine Wisdom sees for it. What God has once done, that they are resolved to abide by, whatever He thinks fit to do afterwards". This, he says, is "to shackle and confine Providence, that it shall not alter its usual methods in the Government of the world; so when it has disposed of the Crown once, shall never be at liberty, while that family lasts, to dispose of it again to any other".³

On the subject of Non-Resistance, Sherlock draws a clear distinction between fighting against a king and not fighting for him, and between driving a king away and allowing him to escape quietly out of his kingdom. "When Kings make it impossible for their subjects to fight for them without fighting against the Religion and Liberties of their Country, then subjects are not bound to assist their Prince".⁴

Francis Fullwood, in *Obedience due to the Present King notwithstanding our Oaths to the Former*,⁵ presents his argument in terms of the King

¹ Sherlock, *Case of Allegiance*, p. 10.

² Sherlock, *Case of Allegiance*, p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, *Vindication of the Case of Allegiance*, pp. 44-45.

⁴ Sherlock, *Case of Allegiance*, pp. 49-50.

⁵ Fullwood, *Obedience due to the present King*, p. 92.

separating his Person from and engaging it against his Crown and Dignity in such a way that the subjects cannot defend both.

"We are not bound", he says, "to assist the Person of the King to the prejudice of his Crown and People".

And on the subject of oaths Burnet had this to say: "The end and design of these oaths was to secure us against the danger of Popery, as any one may see in the Acts by which they were imposed: And tho' all those oaths are still to the King; yet that is to a Prince who subsists upon Law, and rules by Law; and therefore if the King ceases to be King, by subverting our Constitution first, and deserting us next, then all our oaths fall to the ground; as the Matrimonial Oath tho' made for term of life, yet is capable of being dissolved when that which is the essence of the bond is broke".¹ To this new Whig theology of Kingship the Non Jurors in England and their counterparts in Scotland remained impervious.

Was James, however, more than Head of the State by Divine Right? Was he also Head of the Church by Divine Right? If it was believed that to depose the King meant the loss to their nation of godly rule, was it also believed that this involved doing irreparable damage to the Divine Society? Was it believed that the King was part of the essential ordering by God of His Church? Was this the secret, hidden dread of Jacobite Churchmen? Some of the more extreme among them at least must have come very close to this view.

In 1690, there appeared a pamphlet entitled *A Jacobite Form of Prayer and Humiliation*.² It breathed the spirit of extreme theological Jacobitism. It was alleged that it was written by Sancroft, but this is most unlikely, and was most strenuously denied in the *Vindication* which he and the Non Juring Bishops immediately issued. It did, however, give utterance to a violent, passionate Jacobite position which seems to accept the King as Head by Divine Right of both Church and State. I refer to it to do no more than illustrate this extreme view.

James³ is referred to as the stone which foolish builders have rejected, and fervent prayers are offered that God will make him once again the head of the corner. The Church of England⁴ is seen as a ruined vineyard: the bread and wine she dispense have no longer any sacramental value: her priests by swearing fealty to a Usurper have lost the sacred character conferred upon them by their ordination.

¹ Burnet, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs*, p. 9.

² Macaulay, *History of England*, Vol. 5, pp. 291-292; Lathbury, *History of Non Jurors*, p. 60.

³ *Form of Prayer and Humiliation*, p. 60.

⁴ *Form of Prayer and Humiliation*, p. 56.

There is little doubt that the writers of this pamphlet, whoever they were, hoped for an armed revolt supported by French troops and were prepared, if necessary, for the assassination of William; its prayers are to this end, and they are militant and ferocious. For our present purpose, however, we quote this key petition: "Restore unto us again the publick worship of Thy name, the reverent administration of Thy sacraments. Raise up the former Government both in Church and State, that we be no longer without King, without priest, without God in the world".¹

What are the clear implications of this petition? Is it not that if there is no King, there is no Bishop. If there is no King, there is no Church. At least this appears to have been the contemporary view of this extreme Jacobite theology. In a pamphlet written in answer to it, *Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for Jacobites of the Church of England*, the author says: "If therefore that Head of the Church, which they suppose that God has assigned in these our days, be gone; according to that notion, we may be thought to be as without God in the world, shut out of the pale of the Church, and left abroad among publicans and other sinners".²

The subsequent history of the Non Jurors in England refutes completely, of course, this extreme Jacobite position. There developed among the English Non Jurors a high doctrine of the Church, claiming a complete independence from the State in things spiritual, and asserting vigorously the intrinsic powers conveyed to the Church by Christ. Indeed, very soon the English Non Jurors ceased to have any effective links with the King across the water.

This can hardly be claimed, however, for the Stuart Bishops in Scotland. It is, for instance, some thirty years before the theological insights of the English Non Jurors cross into Scotland; then largely due to the influence of Bishops Campbell and Gadderar, whose impact upon the development of the afflicted Church in Scotland was to be decisive.

In *Some Reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration*³ there is also evidence of this high conception of the King's rights by divine appointment over the Church. The author says about the Episcopalians in Scotland: "The King is head of their Church": They preach,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

² *Reflections*, p. 10 (*Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for Jacobites of the Church of England*, 1690).

³ *Somers Tracts*, Vol. I, p. 291. *Some Reflections upon his Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration*, para. 14.

he claims, "an indispensable conformity and obedience to the King's commands as God's vice regent".

Bishop Rose, for instance, gave practical expression to this doctrine of the King's rights over the Church by making it a condition of ordination, even after 1689, that candidates took the Oath to the exiled King. This proved to be a cause of considerable embarrassment to Scottish Episcopalian ministers electing to leave Scotland to seek an appointment in England at the hands of one of the English Bishops: Rose insisted in describing the clergyman concerned, in his Letter of Commendation, as being "a faithful subject of King James 7th".¹ A commendation which was not always very favourably received in England.

It is surely significant that no one from among the Episcopalians in Scotland rose up to vindicate the new theology of the Anglican divines. Burnet, Sherlock and Lloyd have no counterparts in Scottish Episcopalianism. At the Revolution, the Scottish Bishops stood against more than the political consequences of the Revolution; they stood as firmly and determinedly against the new theology of Kingship which the Revolution brought with it, at whatever cost to their persons or to the establishment of their Church in Scotland as the subsequent history of their remnant Church was to show only too clearly.

¹ Wake MSS. Christ Church Library, Oxford. Petition of Mr. Barclay to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.

